REMARKS

Claims 10, 11, 13-21, 23-36, 38, 42, and 43 are pending in this application, of which claims 10, 20, 24, 34, 36, and 42 are independent. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The applicant has amended the title to address the examiner's objection.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the examiner stated:

> **Claims 10 and 22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**
>
> **Regarding claims 10 and 22, the phrase "i.e. performing a channeling" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d)**

Claim 10, as previously presented, did not include the phrase "i.e. performing a channeling." It appears from the Office Action that the examiner is referring instead to claim 12. Both claims 12 and 22 have been canceled, thus rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

Claims 1-9, 40, 41, 45, and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Yu et al. (U.S. 6,684,087). Without conceding the examiner's position, claims 1-9, 40, 41, 45, and 46 have been canceled, thus rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

Claims 10, 11, 13-21, 23-36, 38, 42, and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tso et al. (U.S. 6,185,625) in view of Peterson et al. (U.S. 6,594,682).

Claim 10 has been amended to include the features of canceled claim 12. Claim 10, as amended, recites a data server, to which a portable terminal is connected via a network for receiving contents from a plurality of web servers that respectively provide the contents. The data server includes a channel generator for gathering a plurality of contents having a predetermined subject, provided by the web servers, and binding the contents into a single channel.

On pages 7 and 8 of the Office Action, the examiner stated:

> **Regarding claim 10, Tso teaches a data server, to which a portable terminal is connected via a network for receiving contents from a plurality of web servers that respectively provide the contents, comprising:**
>
> **an image compressor for receiving the contents from the web servers and reducing sizes or numbers of colors of images according to standards of the portable terminal**

(abstract; figures 3 and 7; col. 2, line 49 to col. 3, line 12); and

a proxy unit for monitoring the contents transmitted by the portable terminal or the web server, and when the contents transmitted by the web servers include image information, calling the image compressor (abstract; figures 3 and 7; col. 2, line 49 to col. 3, line 12).

Regarding claim 12, Tso fails to explicitly teach the data server of claim 10, further comprising a channel generator for gathering a plurality of contents having a predetermined subject, provided by the web servers, and binding the contents into a single channel (i.e., performing a channeling). Peterson teaches channeling unit for gathering a plurality of contents of a predetermined subject provided by a plurality of web servers and binding them into a single channel (figure 5). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to gather a plurality of contents and binding them into a single channel in order to organize the content according to user's preference, thus facilitating in searching and retrieving only wanted contents.

Tso discloses a remote scaling server that is configured to request a user-specified encoding preference from a network client, retrieve a content object from a computer network, encode the object in accordance with the requested user-specified encoding preference, and transmit the encoded object to the network client. (Abstract) In Tso, content is compressed and/or scaled at the remote scaling server prior to transmission to the network client. (col. 6, lines 30-36; emphasis added) As acknowledged by the examiner, Tso does not disclose the remote scaling server including "a channel generator for gathering a plurality of contents having a predetermined subject, provided by the web servers, and binding the contents into a single channel."

Peterson discloses a client-server system having multiple Web servers coupled to serve Web content to multiple clients via a distribution system. (FIG. 1; col. 5, lines 51-53) In Peterson, each client includes a browser through which the user constructs custom or personal channels by aggregating content from multiple channels into a single custom channel. (col. 8, lines 43-54, col. 11, lines 48-50). Peterson states:

The user selects a set of channels from the channel pane 122 and indicates the preferred Web content within each channel. The browser takes the user's input and constructs a set of filtration rules based on the user's selections and preferences. The browser then creates a new channel that presents the Web content from the set of channels that survives the filters. (col. 11, lines 50-56; emphasis added)

Subsequently, when the user clicks on a particular channel displayed in a channel pane UI of the client, the browser at the client retrieves Web content from the Web servers, filters the

retrieved Web content using the set of filtration rules associated with the channel, and provides only the Web content that survives the filtration rules in a viewer UI of the client. (col. 11, line 57 – col. 12, line 15)

In Peterson, content is filtered at the client not at a server. (emphasis added) Nowhere does Peterson disclose or suggest a data server that processes the content in any way prior to transmission to the client, much less a data server that includes "a channel generator for gathering a plurality of contents having a predetermined subject, provided by the web servers, and binding the contents into a single channel" as recited in claim 10. Further, there is no motivation for Peterson to include such a data server as Peterson is directed to a client-side system for locally managing Web content:

> **This invention concerns a client-based system that improves gathering an organizing of Web content in a manner that mitigates impact on overburdened servers and slow networks. The client-based system enables personalized filtering to collect only that content which the individual user prefers, while rejecting unwanted content. (col. 4, lines 9-14; emphasis added)**

As such, the applicant disagrees with the examiner's characterization of Peterson. Neither Tso nor Peterson, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the features of claim 10.

For at least these reasons, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 and its dependents are in condition for allowance.

The foregoing remarks also apply to independent claims 20, 24, and 34, which have corresponding limitations, and the claims that depend, directly and indirectly from, claims 20, 24, and 34.

Claim 36, as amended, recites a portable terminal including "a contents processor comprising a proxy unit for monitoring the contents transmitted by the web server, and for calling the contents processor to process the contents provided by the web server to fit its standards when the contents transmitted by the web server include image information; and a channeling unit for gathering the contents of a predetermined subject provided by a plurality of web servers and binding the contents into a single channel."

On page 18 of the Office Action, the examiner stated:

> **Regarding claim 36, Tso teaches in a portable terminal for receiving contents from a network web server, a portable terminal comprising:**

a network interface for accessing the web server via the network (figures 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7); and

a contents processor for processing the contents provided by the web server to fit its standards (figure 7).

It appears from the Office Action that with regards to claim 36, the examiner corresponds the portable terminal with the remote scaling server of Tso. However, with regards to claim 10, the examiner corresponds the portable terminal with the network client of Tso and corresponds the data server with the remote scaling server of Tso. A phrase cannot be interpreted differently in different claims because claim terms must be interpreted consistently. *Southwall Technologies, Inc. v. Cardinal IG Co.*, 54 F.3d 1570, 34 USPQ2d 1673 (Fed. Cir. 1995) The applicant respectfully requests the examiner to more clearly identify which element of Tso the examiner believer discloses the portable terminal of claim 36.

In claim 42, a user terminal connected via a network to a portable terminal and a plurality of web servers that provide contents includes "an image compressor for receiving the contents from the web servers and reducing sizes and number of colors of images of the contents provided by the web servers; a controller for monitoring the contents transmitted by the web server, and when the contents transmitted by the web server include image information, calling the image compressor; and a communication port for transmitting the contents processed by the controller to the portable terminal, wherein the controller further comprises a channeling unit for gathering a plurality of contents of a predetermined subject provided by a plurality of web servers and binding the contents into a single channel."

On page 19 of the Office Action, the examiner stated:

Regarding claim 42, Tso teaches in a user terminal connected via a network to a portable terminal and a plurality of web servers that provide contents, a user terminal comprising: a network interface for accessing the web servers via the network and receiving corresponding contents (figure 3A);

an image compressor for receiving the contents from the web servers and reducing sizes and number of colors of images of the contents provided by the web servers (abstract; figures 1, 3A and 6B);

a controller for monitoring the contents transmitted by the web server, and when the contents transmitted by the web server include image information, calling the image compressor; and

a communication port for transmitting the contents processed by the controller to the portable terminal (abstract; figures 1, 3A and 6B).

It is unclear from the Office Action which element of Tso the examiner believes discloses the user terminal of claim 42. The applicant is unable to make any inferences based on the Office Action as Tso does not include some of the figures to which the examiner points to as teaching various features of claim 42. For example, Tso does not include figures 3A or 6B. Should the examiner persist in this rejection, the applicant respectfully requests the examiner clearly identify which elements of Tso disclose the features of claim 42.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Enclosed is a $60.00 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/28/05

Mandy Jubang
Reg. No. 45,884

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21036395.doc